

SUPPORT FOR THE AMENDMENTS

Claim 3 has been canceled.

Claims 1, 4, and 6 have been added.

Support for the amendment of Claims 1, 4, and 6 is provided by original Claims 1-6.

No new matter has been added by the present amendments.

REMARKS

Claims 1, 2, and 4-8 are pending in the present application.

The rejections of Claims 1-8 under the doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting over issued U.S. patents: U.S. 6,841,580, U.S. 6,951,609, and U.S. 7,026,364; and the provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejections of Claims 1-8 over co-pending U.S. applications: U.S. 10/422,772 and U.S. 10/473,596, are obviated in part by amendment and respectfully traversed in part.

In the outstanding Office Action the Examiner alleges that for each of the above-cited patents or co-pending applications "Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patenably distinct from each other because the claims of this application are deemed to be obvious variants of the above noted claims in the other applications." However, the Examiner makes no attempt to support this conclusion. Such an unsupported allegation is contrary to proper examination procedures, which require that when an Examiner maintains that there is an implicit teaching or suggestion in the prior art, "the Examiner should indicate where (page and line or figure) such a teaching or suggestion appears in the prior art." (*Ex parte Jones*, 62 USPQ2d 1206, 1208 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 2001)). However, in the present application the Examiner has not indicated where, if at all, the artisan would find support for the conclusions of obviousness as the Examiner alleges.

As such, Appellants kindly ask the Examiner to not use their disclosure as the guidepost to bring these two disparate references together. The question that the Examiner should ask is why a person in the art would bring these two references together when they did not have the prior benefit of *Appellants'* disclosure.

Further, Applicants note that Claims 1, 4, and 6 have been amended to recite the limitations of previously pending Claim 3. Specifically, independent Claims 1, 4, and 6 have been amended to define the organic porous ion exchange material as comprising an organic porous cation exchange material and an organic porous anion exchange material, and to specify that the module comprises a stratified bed wherein each bed comprises the organic porous ion exchange material comprising the organic porous cation exchange material and the organic porous anion exchange material (see Claims 1, 4, and 6). Applicants note that none of U.S. 6,841,580, U.S. 6,951,609, U.S. 7,026,364, U.S. 10/422,772, and U.S. 10/473,596 present *a claim* that would read on or fairly suggest the limitations of previously pending Claim 3, which is now a part of independent Claims 1, 4, and 6.

In view of the amendment herein, Applicants submit that the present invention would not be obvious in view of the claims of U.S. 6,841,580, U.S. 6,951,609, U.S. 7,026,364, U.S. 10/422,772, and/or U.S. 10/473,596.

Accordingly, withdrawal of these grounds of rejection is requested.

Applicants submit that the present application is in condition for allowance. Early notification to this effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.
Norman F. Oblon



Vincent K. Shier, Ph.D.
Registration No. 50,552

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413-2220
(OSMMN 08/03)